

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
May 8, 2001

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Binegar, Bost, Breazile, Comer, Dickman, Eastman, Edgley, Fletcher, Fournier Gasem, Henderson, Holcombe, Hsu, Hyle, Kimbrell, Masters, Mayer, Peeper, Perry Sanders, Schestokat, Veenstra, Warde, Weeks, and Wetzel. Also present: J. Barnett, B. Bays, T. Bear, H. Birdwell, J. Damicone, L. Ebro, W. Focht, S. Harp, W. Higgs, A. Marciszewski, U. Melcher, E. Mitchell, V. Mitchell, K. Mokhtari, S. Redwood, G. Robinson, R. Rouse, S. Smethers, J. Van Delinder, G. Waller, N. Watkins, and J. Williams. Absent: Achemire, Dohoney, Gregson, Hoffer, and Martin

HIGHLIGHTS

Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	1
Reports of Standing Committees.....	2
Academic Standards and Policies	2
Campus Facilities, Safety and Security	2
Recommendation: Parking Policy.....	2
Faculty.....	3
Recommendation: Recommendations Related to the Athletic Program.....	4
Student Affairs and Learning Resources.....	7
Research	7
Recommendation: Long-range Research Plan	7
Recommendation: Increase "Fast Pay" Limit	7
Recommendation: Copyrightable Intellectual Property Policy.....	7
Reports of Liaison Representatives.....	8
Student Publications Committee	8
Emeriti Association.....	8
Staff Advisory Council.....	8
Graduate Faculty Council.....	8
New Business	8

James Breazile moved acceptance of the April 10, 2001, Minutes. Tom Peeper seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. James Breazile moved acceptance of the May 8, 2001 Agenda. Tom Peeper seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

00-11-01-BUDG *Guidelines for Third Summer Month Salary for 9- or 11-Month Appointments (Response from Faculty Council):* Under review. The Council endorses the view that payment could be for research, service or teaching activities and could be from state funds. Dr. Keener discussed the recommendation with the deans at the April Deans Council meeting.

- 99-09-01-FAC ***Criminal and Credit Background Checks for Potential Staff Employees:*** Under review. Draft recommendations were finalized in January. A follow-up meeting is being scheduled with Faculty Council and Staff Advisory Council representatives in late May to review the draft document.
- 00-12-02-FAC ***Sabbatical Leave Recommendation:*** Accepted (5/8/01). Deans Council endorsed improved equity for access and consistency in sabbatical application and improved opportunities for alternatives that promote professional development, as long as it benefits the university and does not adversely affect students.
- 01-02-01-ASP ***Amendment to the Academic Appeals Board (AAB) Policy and Procedure Letter 2-0821:*** Under review. Proposed modifications have been incorporated into the policy and are being reviewed by Academic Affairs' administrators and by representatives of the Academic Appeals Board.
- 01-04-01-BUDG ***Market-Driven Salary Increase to Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:*** Under review. Recommendation referred to University Budget Committee for consideration.
- 01-04-02-BUDG ***Faculty Participation in Shaping Fund-Raising Goals:*** Accepted (5/8/01). President will review the internal processes for setting fund raising goals.
- 01-04-04-RP ***Proposed Name Change for Long-Range Planning Committee:*** No objection (5/8/01). Administration does not object to this recommendation and acknowledges that it would require a change in the bylaws of Faculty Council.
- 01-05-01-CFSS ***Parking Policy:*** To President Halligan
- 01-05-02-FAC ***Recommendations Related to the Athletic Program:*** To President Halligan
- 01-05-03-RES ***Long-range Research Plan:*** To President Halligan
- 01-05-04-RES ***Increase "Fast Pay" Limit:*** To President Halligan

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Jacqueline Fletcher

The committee has looked into a number of issues this semester. They include the following:

1. Contact hours and drop policy for condensed courses – The group held discussions with the Dean of University Extension, academic administrators and faculty to explore issues associated with the increasing number and use of condensed courses. At this time, the committee is not recommending specific changes; they recommend periodic review as condensed course offerings evolve.
2. Student-faculty responsibilities – A recommendation to Council is anticipated in Fall 2001 about expectations and responsibilities of students and faculty.
3. Academic integrity/athletics – Jacque, as chair of ASAP and member of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee

of Athletic Council, has been working with the chair of the Faculty Committee on ways to enhance the academic performance of athletes. 4. Final exam scheduling conflicts – Contrary to popular belief, to date no written policy exists to help students spread their exams out when they have 4 or more scheduled for one day. June 2001 it is hoped that Council will have the opportunity to approve such a policy. In addition, Council should expect a proposal to eliminate scheduling conflicts for daytime and evening classes Fall 2001. 5. Bachelor's of University Studies (BUS) degree – At the request of Jack Vitek, the ASAP Committee has been reviewing this degree, given its unique status as a degree not linked to a specific department. 6. Academic Computing Advisory Committee (ACAC) – At the suggestion of Dr. Keener, the committee has developed a proposal for a new charge for this committee that will include coordination, minimization of duplication of systems or services, and proactive planning for campus technological services. In June or September 2001, Council can expect a recommendation that will link ACAC with the newly renamed Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Marcia Dickman

It is the hope of this committee that a campus ecology view of issues associated with parking and moving people around campus would result in survey/focus group information from all stakeholders involved. Access to information is also needed so that informed decisions and input can be provided. Given these concerns and needs, "The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan the following: that no major change to present parking policy, either as suggested by the Walker Report or any University entity, be implemented, even on a trial basis, until all stakeholders have had an opportunity to be polled." **Rationale:** The University Parking Committee currently has plans to implement a major change in policy, on a trial basis, in two parking lots beginning July 2001. One lot for students and one for faculty are designated to be reserved lots with a substantial fee increase to park in those lots. The Walker Consultant Report on parking on the Oklahoma State University campus has generated quite a bit of interest among the University community and the larger Stillwater community, including OSU students, staff, faculty, and administrators as well as other citizens of the city. As is widely known, parking has been a concern for several years. In the 1999 Student Satisfaction Inventory, for example, students rated the item, "The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate," as highly important (6.31 on a seven point scale) but quite unsatisfactory (2.34 on a seven point scale) – the least satisfactory item in the inventory. This low satisfaction is particularly noteworthy given the high importance given to parking. It is suggested that the ad hoc discussions that have been conducted to date with selected organizations and other groups are neither sufficiently representative nor accommodating of the views of all stakeholders. Moreover, since the parking problem and its likely solutions are closely related to other problems that the university is facing, such as bussing on and off campus and bicycling, it is suggested that these problems be considered together. For these reasons, it is recommended that a study of the concerns and preferences of all stakeholders should be conducted and communicated to decision-makers. Given the high importance and potential implications associated with the parking problem, it is essential that the decision process be seen as transparent, informed, and responsive to stakeholder concerns and preferences. It is recommended that two complementary investigations be conducted: the administration of an opinion survey followed by the conduct of a series of focus group discussions. **Discussion:** Joe Williams, Chair of the University Parking Committee, asked to speak. He noted that "parking is a big problem for everyone – students, faculty, staff, alumni, the Athletic Department, Posse group, etc." We need to generate more money and slots for parking. A 1998 survey gathered information from 936 faculty and staff, who responded, indicating that 49.1% had a preference for some form of reserved

parking. The 1994 guidelines for the Parking and Traffic Committee charged them to consider allowing persons (faculty, staff and students) to purchase reserved parking spaces for convenience based on location of lots. At the same time, a transit system was put in place to help with parking problems. Later, Walker Parking Consultants were asked to provide their expertise in exploring possibilities, which they did last year. Discussion this semester examined the possibility of setting up reserved spaces in two lots – \$40 a month for faculty/staff and \$30 a month for students. The motion to set up these reserved lots outside Willard Hall and Whitehurst passed at the Parking and Traffic Committee last meeting and plans are in place to implement this on a trial basis this Fall. Lively discussion followed. Robert Mayer reminded the group that we talked about this report last Fall and were assured that no radical steps would be taken right away. He also noted that there appear to be two basic approaches to generating money for parking: 1) agree on the amount of money that needs to be raised and raise parking proportionally for everyone, or 2) have selected people who are willing to pay \$500 a year for parking for faculty and staff and \$400 a year for students. The reserved spaces seem to be supporting this latter option which sets up a two-tiered system based on ability to pay. In Robert's opinion this strategy is not equitable. What appears to be more sound is to talk about how much money needs to be raised and then figure out a way to raise the money. Chuck Edgley noted that what this trial will determine is what will the traffic bear. There will be a class system demonstrated in where you park. He also asked if there were a crisis of confidence given that we were told last December that in no uncertain terms no one would be looking at an overnight increase. But, for those who work in Willard Hall, it seems they are looking at this now. Robert Mayer then asked how the group will look at how the reserved slots work – "how will you determine if it has worked? People who park in those lots may well be happy, will more follow because those who can pay are happy?" A number of additional questions were raised. Ken Eastman then stated that we should try this because it is an effort to find something that works even though more input would be helpful and make people feel better. Tom Peeper noted, however, that this plan does not create any new parking spaces and does not raise that much money. It seems that we are looking at how many lots we can raise the parking rate on and sell that many slots and raise some money. It was suggested that we could probably stand to take a few more months, get a survey prepared and let the students, faculty and staff comment. Justin Barnett, a student representative on the Parking Committee and Vice President of the Off-campus Student Association, said students were told about this one day after the last SGA meeting. He feels that not enough time has been given to the students to review this. The input they have been provided has been limited and not specific. Students want to be able to implement a trial run and use the "concrete" data to help in making decisions. If this is a trial run, what questions do we want answered? Do we know what dollars are needed? Limited resources and the auction of those resources seems a unique perspective for the academy. We cannot auction resources when they become limited. A roll call vote was taken: 22 to 3 in favor of the recommendation.

FACULTY — Larry Sanders

For the past two years, the Faculty Committee of Faculty Council has been looking at the athletic program at OSU. That review has focused on concerns about the program and possible exploitation of students. This year has been spent investigating issues from multiple perspectives. The group feels like they have come full circle and are ready to make a recommendation. Larry Sanders noted that two groups exist in extreme: – our concern about athletics should be that we have a winning team and, – athletics has no place in the academy and would like nothing better/or care less if we did not have it. The committee has tried to find a way to bridge that chasm. It is time to begin to

act; we see common ground. The move is toward improving communications between Faculty Council and the Athletic Council. To that end, the committee recommends the following: Title: Recommendations Related to the Athletic Program. 1. Reorganize the communication link between Faculty Council and the Athletics Department by: a. implementing a new Faculty Council standing committee termed the Athletics Committee with at least one member also on the Athletic Council; b. formalizing a regular system of communication between the Academic Counseling Office for Athletics and the Faculty Council. (This could be done by having the director of that office as an ex-officio member of the Athletics Committee or Academic Standards Committee.); c. formalizing a regular system of communication with the Faculty Council and the Athletic Director that would include direct dialog on an annual basis. This could be done by meeting with the Athletics Committee and the Faculty Council. 2. Key OSU leaders (AD Phillips, President Halligan, Dr. Keener, the chair of the Board of Regents, and a student representative) should meet with the Faculty Committee and Executive leadership of Faculty Council to discuss our shared concerns and search for common ground. If consensus is found, we should: a. determine how best to proceed with joint responsibility to expand awareness and understanding among faculty, staff, students, state legislators, fans and the Oklahoma public; b. determine a plan of action for the president and AD to provide leadership in seeking similar consensus among other Big 12 institutions and nationally. 3. The Faculty Council should plan a conference on campus within the next year to address the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and academics and seek consensus among OSU stakeholders (administration, faculty, staff, students). Some consideration could be given to expanding this to a regional (Big 12) or national conference. 4. An independent study should be commissioned by the President and or AD as soon as possible to explore previously noted concerns such as retention, GPA's, and graduation rates. 5. The new Athletics Committee should consider these potential recommendations (some are mutually exclusive): a. change the reporting procedures to improve transparency of academic integrity of the athletic program, while maintaining confidentiality of students participating in athletics; classes of enrollment, grades, specific distinction between sports teams, NCAA athletes, other athletes are suggested categories; b. restrict athletes who do not meet normal admission standards from athletic participation until they can demonstrate successful achievement in their academic program; c. provide adequate disability insurance for students participating in sports; d. allow athletes to participate in sports without academic participation for up to 4 years; upon completion of athletic activity, offer subsidized college education to completion of a degree if academic standards can be maintained; e. compensate the players of at least some teams beyond athletic grants (scholarships), recognizing possible changes in student and amateur status. 6. Changes need to be made in OSU Foundation fund-raising to reduce the competition between athletics and other academic programs. Examples include art and theatre facilities, library improvements and research funding. 7. The Athletic Department and its sports programs should be required to pay the general university fund for reasonable indirect costs for use of the parking lots, security force, legal staff, administrative services, etc. NOTE: MINORITY VIEWS – 1. One committee member does not feel that recommendation #7 is appropriate at this time, given the larger context of this set of recommendations, and further believes that more research needs to be conducted to ascertain the relevant specific facts. 2. One committee member does not agree with consideration of the potential idea to compensate players while they are students because it would create an inequitable situation relative to other students who provide service to the university without compensation (i.e., student actors in university plays, art students who produce art for public display, student members of livestock and fair judging teams). **RATIONALE:** The Faculty Committee of OSU Faculty

Council has conducted two years of study and discussion with a variety of knowledgeable faculty and administrators focused on questions related to possible exploitation of students participating in "big-time" team sports and in the academic integrity of the athletic program. The Committee feels strongly that marginal changes have not and will not work to resolve the problems. While some of the recommendations listed below relate to marginal changes or improvements, the Committee hopes that dialogue with a broader group (as noted in recommendations below) will begin the process of substantive, significant changes in the structure and definition of the athletic program, especially with major men's team sports. The final dialogue of this Committee was conducted with Terry Don Phillips, OSU Athletic Director. Phillips has reviewed this list and is in substantial agreement with the 14 points.

1. The Faculty Committee and the Athletic Director (hereafter both referred to as "we") agree that, at the heart of this issue, students who participate in collegiate sports are our primary concern.
2. We agree that coaching staff are put in an often untenable situation with expectations of others that they win, while the faculty expects them to be concerned with the players academic pursuits.
3. We agree that the seemingly unending escalation of money required for Division I athletic competition, often referred to as the "arms war of NCAA athletics", is of deep concern and needs to be stopped or curtailed.
4. We agree that the community of the university needs to recognize what is at stake and the price and decide with full awareness at what level of activity the athletic program should be conducted.
5. We agree that an independent study of academic integrity of the athletic program should be conducted, focusing on retention rates, GPA's, and graduation rates. Also to be considered are related data for the general student body.
6. We agree that the future of many team sports would be in question if the major sports were eliminated or diminished.
7. We agree that forces external to the university play a major role in the problems, including the "arms war".
8. We agree that many of the top recruited NCAA athletes often come from disadvantaged backgrounds that put them at a severe deficit in beginning college-level academic programs.
9. We have some disagreement over whether such athletes should be recruited at all.
10. We agree that some recruited students who are both athletically and academically qualified go elsewhere primarily because of concerns with relatively low graduation rates at OSU.
11. We share some uncertainty over possible solutions, including a possible professionalization option. However, we agree that OSU could not pursue such options alone.
12. We have some disagreement over the adverse impact of athletic fund-raising on fund-raising for other activities.
13. We have some disagreement over the construction of a new football stadium.
14. We have unresolved questions about the financial soundness of the athletics program.

Again, discussion was lively. It was noted that this recommendation would result in the creation of a committee and a starting agenda. It was asked, what is the relationship between the Athletic Council and this committee? The new committee and the Athletic Council would not do the same thing and the problems Faculty Council might have do not appear to be on the agenda of this Athletic Council. There is a long tradition of involvement by faculty in athletics. The Athletic Council reports to the NCAA not the Faculty Council. Dave Fournier noted that the Faculty Council can set up two types of committees – standing and special – and that we need to think carefully about this. Maybe the way to deal with communication is to formalize the role of the liaison with the Athletic Council. Some believe other standing committees could work with the Athletic Council right now and another committee is not needed. Others think problems with athletics are one of the major issues on this campus and this focus on athletics is needed. Academic integrity is a bigger question than just GPAs and graduation rates. We need to take a different look at issues and concerns around NCAA and athletics at OSU. The recommendation passed.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Bill Weeks

The focus of this report was the study of university technology fees. In sum, 4 to 4.5% of the fees go to paper and toner. The cost of printing is 1 to 3 cents per page. Their study indicated that approximately 60 to 70 percent of students never use a technology fee lab. It is a common perception that a few students do the bulk of the printing. Currently the technology fee fund has a 2.3 million-dollar surplus but it is likely that the purchase of computers in bulk should virtually clear that account shortly. Future use of Smart Cards would regulate printer limits. It may cost \$80,000 to recard the campus, at a cost of \$10-12 per card.

RESEARCH — Richard Bost

Three recommendations were presented: 1. Long-range Research Plan – **The Faculty Council recommends to President Halligan that:** he empower a task force whose job is to create a long-term plan for research. **Rationale:** The University currently has three groups known to this Committee who are working on recommendations for increasing OSU's research productivity. These groups are: the Research Initiative Group headed by the President; the Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Vice President for Research; the Faculty Council Research Committee (this committee). The first two of these groups has recently finished its work, and a written report produced. However, a task force should be formed (or a current one charged) to propose a more specific plan of action to accomplish the needs described in the report. The University's plan must be formulated so as to cooperate with and participate in other research initiatives, for example, the state-wide effort to develop a three-pronged research thrust and the efforts to build activities in the Research Park. The work of these groups as well as the findings of administrative reviewers needs to be codified into a written action plan, complete with goals and objectives that will guide the research efforts of the University over the next 10 years. We recommend that the President, representatives from the OSU Foundation, faculty, the Vice President for Research, College Research Directors, selected alumni, leaders of industry be represented on this task force. We wish to emphasize that the faculty considers this to be an urgent matter that is deserving of immediate and vigorous effort. We also wish to emphasize our readiness, as faculty, to assist the president in accomplishing this recommendation. With this taskforce it is hoped that a systematic way to implement the recommendations of the research initiatives into a systematic plan for the university can be achieved. The recommendation passed. 2. Increase "Fast Pay" Limit. **The Faculty Council recommends to President Halligan that:** the dollar limit on "Fast Pay" purchases be increased substantially. **Rationale:** The current limit was set a number of years ago. In the intervening time the costs of routine research equipment and supplies has increased substantially. There are two principal consequences of this situation. 1) It is impossible to acquire some items for rapidly testing new ideas that arise in the course of a research project. 2) The paperwork load of requesting purchase orders and obtaining approval has substantially increased, further slowing the process of obtaining necessary supplies and equipment. This recommendation would increase the limit of expenditures on fast pay accounts substantially, up from \$1499. Harry Birdwell updated the group noting that a buying card is being put in place with a dollar limit of \$2500 per purchase. It looks like this will facilitate our goal. The recommendation passed. 3. Copyrightable Intellectual Property Policy. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:** he recommend to the Board of Regents that they adopt the attached proposed policy to govern matters relating to copyrightable intellectual property at Oklahoma State University. The original policy was untabled and removed. This new policy was recommended and tabled for consideration, hopefully, at the June Council meeting. The fundamental premise of the policy supports the basic right and

responsibility of faculty to create copyrightable works. Exceptions or ambiguous circumstances to this would result in letters of agreement. These would be needed only when there is a question about which of the basic categories a product would fall into. A copy of the policy is available at the following website: <http://com.net.okstate.edu/copyright/index.html>. The tone of the document has been dramatically changed and the regular work of faculty are clearly their own. They will need no letters of agreement for their personal works. Exceptions would be OSU commissioned, sponsored and/or institutional works. Exceptional circumstances would be needed for personal works to fall under consideration of a letter of agreement. James Breazile noted that the tenor of the policy was still that of protection of the university when our concern should be to protect the faculty member.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Student Publications Committee — Bill Weeks

Contact the O'Collegian to purchase a photo CD of every picture that appeared in the paper this past year. Cost is \$49.95.

Emeriti Association — Roscoe Rouse.

Last week was the last council meeting of the Association for the current year. May 9 will be the last general membership meeting and Dr. Harry Birdwell will be the speaker. At their council meeting on May 2, the Nominating Committee made its annual report and accepted the report and called for a vote of the membership on the report at the Membership Meeting on May 9. The officers recommended for the Association for the year 2001-2002, by the Nominating Committee, as approved by the Council, are: President, Esther Winterfeldt; President Elect, Larry Jones; Vice President, Lois Mickle; Immediate Past President, Roscoe Rouse; Treasurer, Helmer Sorenson; Secretary, Susan Richardson; and Councilors, David Batchelder, 1999-2002; Russell Conway, 2001-2004; Norman Durham, 2001-2004; LeRoy Fischer, 2000-2003; John Franzmann, 2000-2003; Virginia Krenn, 2001-2004; Joe Owen, 1999-2002; Mary Lou Sare, 2001-2003; and E. L. Stair, Jr., 1999-2002. Appointments to Faculty Council committees will be made by the incoming president of the Association for 2001-2002.

Staff Advisory Council — Wes Higgs

Lotus Notes training is planned for noon May 9 at a brown bag lunch. At the June meeting they will have officer elections; Council members were elected this month.

Graduate Faculty Council — Bill Warde

At their last meeting, the Council put forward to the administration a Ph.D. in Geography.

NEW BUSINESS:

Bill Warde and Chuck Edgley presented resolutions commending outgoing councilors and officers. Diane LaFollette was also thanked for her continued service to Faculty Council.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is 6/12/01.